Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/576,628	PETZELT ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ERNST V. ARNOLD	1616	
All Participants:	Status of Application:		
(1) <u>ERNST V. ARNOLD</u> .	(3)		
(2) <u>Joseph Coppola</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 10 March 2010	Time:		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .	ant's representative)		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
Claims discussed:			
Prior art documents discussed:			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	e examiner will provide a writte record of the substance of the	en summary of the interview, since	ne substance
/Ernst V Arnold/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1616	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if a	appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner noted that the cited art teach inhalation of xenon for sedation while Applicant disclosed introduction directly into the intestine or indirectly via the stomach in the protection of endothelial cells of the instestine in sepsis (pages 6-7 of the specification). The Examiner suggested to Applicant's representative that such an amendment would not be obvious over the cited references and put the case in condition for allowance. After consultation with the inventors, Applicant's representative informed the Examiner on 3/16/10 that such a limitation was not acceptable.